

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 7-9, 12 and 15 have been amended. Claims 3, 18, 21-31, and 33-45 have been canceled (claims 19-20, 32, 46-53 and 56 were previously cancelled). No new claim has been added in this response. No new matter has been added.

Objections to Drawings

Applicants hereby submit a new set of drawings. The objections are believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejections

§112 Rejections

Claims 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Applicants amended claim 1 to remove the limitation “without sending the message to an entity associated with the specified destination telephone number.” Thus, the §112 rejections to claims 4-9 are believed to be overcome.

§103 Rejections

Independent claims 1, 54 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Smith (U.S. Pub no. 2002/0042277) in view of Chern (U.S. Pat no. 6,456,854). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, as currently amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:

receiving a message sent over a network by a first user from a mobile device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices;

identifying a specified destination telephone number of the message;

determining whether the specified destination telephone number corresponds to a predetermined telephone number;

if the specified destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined telephone number, then

using an indicator in the message to **identify network-based content authored by a second user**, and

sending the network-based content to the first user in response to the message.

(Emphasis added)

In contrast, Smith and Chern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation, namely, to identify network-based content authored by a second user. Both Smith and Chern disclose a method of providing the location information of a mobile device (e.g., cell phone, etc.). A mobile device's location information is a fact regarding the mobile device, and therefore is not the same as content authored by a user.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, Smith does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are therefore patentable over Smith.

Independent claim 54 recites:

54. A method of providing a directory of published content to a user of a mobile device operating on a wireless network, the method comprising:

receiving a first message from a first mobile device via the wireless network, the first message initiated by a first user using the first mobile device, the first message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices;

detecting a predetermined indicator in the first message, wherein the predetermined indicator indicates that the first message is not to be sent to a second mobile device associated with a destination telephone number of the first message but to request content published by a second user of the second mobile device; and

in response to detecting the predetermined indicator in the first message,

identifying a set of network-based content published by the second user, and

sending to the first mobile device a second message identifying the set of network-based content, as a response to the first message, the second message conforming to said protocol.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Smith and Chern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations. Smith discloses that the location request message can contain the telephone number of the mobile device of which the location is requested. However, Smith does not teach or suggest that the mobile device's telephone number is the destination telephone number of the location request message. Smith discloses that the location request message can contain a “*LOC” indicator to indicate that the message is to request location information of a mobile device. However, Smith does not teach or suggest that the “*LOC” indicator also indicates that the location request message is not to be sent to a device associated with the location request message's destination telephone number. In fact, if the location request message's destination number is the telephone number associated with the server providing the location request service, the location request message must be sent to the server for the service. Thus, Smith does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations. Chern also does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations. Neither does the Examiner contend so.

It is also not obvious, because using a message's destination telephone number as a way to locate content but not sending the message to the mobile device associated with the destination telephone number is not a conventional way of handling a message.

At least for the foregoing reasons, claim 54 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Smith and Chern.

Independent claim 58 recites limitations similar to those discussed above for claim 54. Thus, at least for the reasons discussed above for claim 54, claim 58 and all claims which depend on it are also patentable over Smith and Chern.

Independent claim 12 stands rejected under §103(a) based on Thakker (U.S. 6,487,602) in view of Smith and Chern. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 12, as currently amended, recites:

12. A method of providing access to network-based content, the method being performed in a processing system coupled to a wireless network and to a wireline computer network, the method comprising:

receiving a message sent over the wireless network by a first end user from a mobile device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices, **the message including a telephone number of a second end user;**

identifying a destination telephone number to which the message is directed, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a network entity other than an end user;

determining whether the destination telephone number corresponds to a predetermined number;

if the destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined number, then

identifying a predetermined indicator in the message,
using the telephone number of the second end user and the predetermined indicator in the message to identify network-based content authored by the second end user, and

sending the network-based content to the first end user.

(Emphasis added)

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement that Thakker does not teach or suggest the message including a telephone number of a second end user and using the telephone number of the second end user in the message to identify network-based content (Office action mailed on 2/9/2007, page 12). However, the Examiner alleges that Smith and Chern teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation of using the telephone number of the second end user and the predetermined indicator in the message to identify network-based content authored by the second end user. As discussed above for claim 1, Smith and Chern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitation of using a telephone

number and/or an indicator to identify network-based content authored by a user. Therefore, Thakker, Smith, and Chern, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest using a telephone number of an end user in a message to identify network-based content authored by the end user, such as recited in claim 12. Thus, at least for the above reasons, claim 12 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Thakker, Smith, and Chern.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 9, 2007


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300